Interview Summary Application No. 10/061,151 Examiner Elena Tsoy Art Unit Elena Tsoy Art Unit (1) Elena Tsoy (3) Tricing Haurer (3) Haurer (4) Haurer (5) SCHWARTZ ET AL. Art Unit (6) (7) (8)

(2) Harn's Pitlick

(2) Harn's Pitlick

(3) 3C(CINC MAUNE)

(4) ______

Date of Interview: 24 June 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: ______

Claim(s) discussed: All replied att

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

- I Attorney argued that Murao is applied as outside coating and requires particular the use of nonionic surfactants.
- 2. Kypopka should be initialed accor beause it was discussed in specification (see page 2, lines 31+).